

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

COMMITTEE MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
SUSTAINABILITY AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

JOE SERNA, JR., CALEPA BUILDING
1001 I STREET
2ND FLOOR
COASTAL VALLEY HEARING ROOM
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 2005
9:30 A.M.

TIFFANY C. KRAFT, CSR, RPR
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
LICENSE NUMBER 12277

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Ms. Rosario Marin

Ms. Rosalie Mul

BOARD MEMBER PRESENT

Ms. Cheryl Peace

STAFF

Mr. Mark Leary, Executive Director

Ms. Julie Nauman, Chief Deputy Director

Ms. Marie Carter, Chief Counsel

Mr. Eric Bissinger, Staff

Mr. Elliot Block, Staff Counsel

Ms. Rebecca Brown, Staff

Mr. Steve Boyd, Staff

Ms. Terri Edwards, Staff

Ms. Betty Fernandez, Staff

Mr. Keir Furey, Staff

Ms. Maria Kakutani, Staff

Ms. Susan Kumpulainen, Committee Secretary

Mr. Jim La Tanner, Supervisor, Loan Program

Ms. Natalie Lee, Staff

Mr. Howard Levenson, Deputy Director

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF

Ms. Cara Morgan, Branch Manager, Office of Local Assistance

Mr. Zane Poulson, Staff

Ms. Yasmin Satter, Staff

Mr. Pat Schiavo, Deputy Director

Ms. Allison Spreadborough, Staff

Mr. Steve Uselton, Supervisor, Los Angeles Assistance Section

Ms. Patty Wohl, Deputy Director

ALSO PRESENT

Ms. Tammy Bennett, City of Fairfield

Ms. Carey Dale, City of Ontario

Ms. Marcia Godwin, City of Chino

Ms. Linda Herman, City of Chico

Mr. Ken Jeske, Director of Public Works and Community Services, City of Ontario

Mr. Ron Manfredi, City Manager, City of Kerman

Ms. Lisa Matterd, City of Orange

Mr. Mike Miller, City of Stockton

Mr. Brian Pinske, Arboricultural Specialities

Mr. Ken Pianin, City of Fremont

Ms. Teresa Lewandowski, Pacific Waste Consulting Group

Mr. Scott Smithline, Californians Against Waste

INDEX

	PAGE
Roll Call And Declaration Of Quorum	2
A. Diversion, Planning And Local Assistance Deputy Director's Report	3
B. Discussion Of Survey Regarding Barriers To Construction And Demolition Debris Reuse And Recycling	5
C. Consideration Of The Amended Nondisposal Facility Element For The City Of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County	39
D. Consideration Of An Amendment To The Los Angeles Area Integrated Waste Management Authority To Add The City of Hermosa Beach As A Member To The Regional Agency Agreement (LARA)	
E. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension By The City Of Madera, Madera County	40
F. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension By The City Of Stockton, San Joaquin County	42
G. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension By The City Of Chino, San Bernardino County	47
H. Consideration Of A Second SB1066 Time Extension Application By The Following Jurisdictions: City Of Ontario, San Bernardino County; And City of Santee, San Diego County	54
I. Consideration Of A Second SB1066 Application By The City of Kerman, Fresno County	64
J. Consideration Of The Petition For Sludge Diversion Credit And Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2003 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element For The City Of Fairfield, Solano County	68

INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
K. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element For The City Of Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County	71
L. Consideration Of The Amended Nondisposal Facility Element For The Town Of Portola Valley, San Mateo County	73
M. Consideration Of The Amended Nondisposal Facility Element For The City Of Fremont, Alameda County	74
N. Consideration Of The Five-Year Review Report Of The Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan For the County Of Alameda	75
O. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element For The City Of Orange, Orange County	76
P. Waste Prevention And Market Development Deputy Director's Report	79
Q. Consideration Of The Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program Application For Arboricultural Specialties, Inc.	80
R. Consideration Of Application To Renew The Chico Recycling Market Development Zone Designation	86
S. Adjournment	88
T. Reporter's Certificate	90

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Good morning, and
3 welcome to the Sustainability and Market Development
4 Committee. I'm so happy to be here with all of you.
5 Thank you for being here.

6 I have to read a statement regarding the actions
7 of this Committee today. As many of you know, the Board
8 currently has two vacancies, which has resulted in this
9 Committee only having two members. The Committee is made
10 up of Ms. Rosalie Mulé and myself. We have an invited
11 guest that's joining us today, Cheryl Peace, but she is
12 not a member of the Committee. As a result, we will
13 proceed with our meeting today and hear all of the items
14 before us. We will refrain from voting on these items
15 and/or recommending any of them for the Board consent
16 agenda.

17 Based upon the discussion today and at our other
18 Committee meetings, our Executive Director will compile a
19 proposed consent agenda for the Board meeting for those
20 items that do not appear to require further discussion
21 before the full Board. And if this Committee goes as we
22 envision it, most of the items should actually go on the
23 consent agenda. Just for those of you that have items
24 pending before us, because we cannot take a vote, it does
25 not necessarily mean that you have to come back for the

1 full Board. Unless you hear a dissent between the two
2 Board members up here, then you will have to most likely
3 come before the Board and make your case at that time.

4 So we are having fewer Board members on the Board
5 right now, and we will restructure most likely some of the
6 Committees so we will have -- later on, so that we will
7 have the three full members. But it was too fast for us
8 to do it over this Committee meeting and this Board
9 meeting. So we're going to do it, if we need to, by the
10 next Board meeting.

11 But believe we, we'll have all of the discussion.
12 The meeting will be conducted just exactly the way we've
13 always conducted the Committee meetings, except that we
14 will not have a vote. And unless otherwise noted, we will
15 probably ask you to come before the Board to make your
16 case before the Board.

17 With that said, can we call the roll, please?

18 SECRETARY KUMPULAINIEN: Chair Marin?

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Here.

20 SECRETARY KUMPULAINIEN: Member Mulé?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Present.

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: And for the record,
23 our invited guest, Ms. Cheryl Peace. She actually just
24 needs to be present for one portion of the agenda that
25 she's very interested in. She's always welcome to be here

1 with us. Thank you, Ms. Peace.

2 Any ex partes?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: I'm up to date, Chair
4 Marin.

5 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Great. So am I.

6 Do you need to report anything, Ms. Peace?

7 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: I'm up to date.

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Excellent. That saves
9 time.

10 Ms. Patty Wohl, what do you have?

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Actually, I think this is
12 kind of a joint effort.

13 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Pat is going first.
14 Pat, Patty, what can I say?

15 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Can't get it wrong.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Mr. Pat Schiavo.

17 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay, of the Diversion,
18 Planning, and Local Assistance Division.

19 Just a few notes. February 24th was the last
20 date for submittals regarding comments of our alternative
21 compliance system. We have received about a dozen or so
22 comments. We actually, you know, informally are leaving
23 the comment period open. And if people want to submit
24 late, they can. We anticipate bringing an item forward
25 probably around May or so to look at, you know, comments,

1 make an assessment of what we've heard to date, as well as
2 put forth our own staff proposal for the Board to hear.

3 Staff is moving forward regarding our logic
4 database system. That's the one that ties all of the
5 databases together. So instead of going into individual
6 databases, it's just one-stop shopping. You get into the
7 portal, and then you can go anywhere you want. It's going
8 to save our customers a lot of time and effort in finding
9 information, current, up-to-date data. So doing really
10 well there.

11 We're still moving forward on turning the ship
12 around and focusing more on technical assistance efforts
13 to local jurisdictions, trying to get away from the
14 process stuff we're doing. So we're moving ahead with
15 that and the designs on how to make that work better.

16 And as well as the item you're going to be
17 hearing today regarding C&D. You know, that was a
18 collective effort with many different divisions within the
19 Board. And so that effort was wrapped up, and you'll be
20 hearing introduction by Howard regarding that item, and
21 then Allison will be giving a presentation.

22 And then, finally, you did get a note from the
23 representative that one particular Item Number 7, D, is
24 being suggested to be pulled because she can't come up and
25 make a presentation regarding that.

1 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: That should be no
2 problem.

3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: That concludes my
4 presentation.

5 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: So we go to the next
6 item.

7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Sure. The next item
8 will be Item B in your Committee packet. That's
9 Discussion of Survey Regarding Barriers to Construction
10 and Demolition Debris Reuse and Recycling. And Howard
11 Levenson will make the introductory remarks.

12 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEVENSON: Thank you, Pat. Good
13 morning, Madam Chair, Members Mulé and Peace. Glad to see
14 you all here. I'm Howard Levenson with the Permitting and
15 Enforcement Division. I'd like to introduce this item,
16 give you a little bit of context for it before turning it
17 over to Allison Spreadborough for the major presentation.

18 This item is the result or a discussion of the
19 results of a cross-divisional staff survey of LEAs, local
20 government officials, and private entities regarding
21 barriers to increased recycling and reuse of construction
22 and demolition, or C&D, debris in California.

23 The survey stems from a discussion that was held
24 at the April 2004 Board meeting about the status of
25 construction and demolition debris handling activities, at

1 which time P&E staff reported on the status of facilities
2 in the regulatory framework. There were a number of
3 concerns mentioned at that meeting about potential
4 barriers to increased recycling of C&D debris. So the
5 Board directed staff to initiate this kind of
6 cross-divisional survey effort. It was sponsored by all
7 three of the divisions here: P&E, Markets, and DPLA. So
8 Pat, Patty, and I were co-executive sponsors.

9 The timing for this item we think is auspicious
10 for several reasons. First of all, the Board just heard
11 the results of the latest waste characterization study,
12 which indicates that C&D debris still comprises over 20
13 percent of the disposal stream.

14 Secondly, the Board just had its own retreat in
15 January to discuss priorities for the next 12 to 18
16 months. And a number of the ideas that are discussed in
17 this item encompass C&D related issues; for example, green
18 building, partnerships, continued waste characterization
19 analysis. Those are all things that had been discussed as
20 part of that retreat and subsequent discussions.

21 Related to that, under Executive Director Mark
22 Leary's guidance, staff will be bringing an action item
23 before the Board hopefully next month that outlines these
24 priorities in more detail, proposes specific measurable
25 goals and outcomes, and discusses implementation steps and

1 resource needs. Because of this, that kind of sequence of
2 events, we feel that today's discussion of the C&D survey
3 and related information is an important step in providing
4 you with additional background information for next
5 month's discussion about priorities.

6 Before I turn it over to Allison, I want to
7 acknowledge all the staff who worked very hard on this
8 survey. It took quite a lot of time and effort by a lot
9 of folks. We had Catherine Cardozo, Nick Cavagnaro, Randy
10 Friedlander, Greg Dick, Raffy Kouyoumdjian, Cheri Davis,
11 Trevor O'Shaughnessy, Francisco Gutterres, and last, but
12 certainly not least, Ms. Allison Spreadborough, who did
13 yeowoman's work on honchoing this working group. And
14 she's prepared to give a presentation of this. But I do
15 want to thank her for all the time and effort she devoted
16 to this. So with that, I'll turn it over to Allison.

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you, Allison.

18 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
19 presented as follows.)

20 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: Thank you. Good morning.

21 On April 14th, 2004, the Board directed staff to
22 create a cross-divisional work group to identify
23 construction and demolition reuse and recycling barriers
24 in California.

25 On May 19th, 2004, we held the first C&D work

1 group meeting.

2 In October 2004, an electronic survey was
3 e-mailed to 2,433 individuals with a two-week window of
4 response.

5 --o0o--

6 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: The objective of the survey
7 process was to obtain stakeholder opinions on barriers to
8 C&D reuse and recycling. Staff needed to identify target
9 groups, design a survey, and obtain e-mail addresses of
10 all known C&D handlers, recycling advocates, construction
11 industry representatives, local enforcement agencies,
12 solid waste industry representatives, C&D distribution
13 list, and the Board and Committee agenda mailing list.

14 --o0o--

15 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: In the survey, participants
16 were asked to identify and rank the five most significant
17 barriers. Participants could select more detailed
18 sub-barrier descriptions or write in their own barrier or
19 write in a general comment.

20 Our Information Management Branch compiled the
21 electronic data, and the work group staff grouped and
22 analyzed the data and summarized the key findings.

23 --o0o--

24 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: Here are the 12 barrier
25 possibilities in the survey. The ones indicated in red

1 are the ones that came out in the top three.

2 We have: Business difficulty for recycler
3 processors; CIWMB and legislative issues; facilities;
4 industry education and training; local enforcement agency;
5 local mandates; local ordinances, plans, policies,
6 programs, and procedures; lower cost options; markets;
7 public education; recycled content product difficulties;
8 and regulations for C&D debris processing.

9 --o0o--

10 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: The primary respondent groups
11 were non-regulatory public agencies with 65 respondents;
12 private solid waste industry with 49 respondents; and
13 regulatory public agencies, those were mostly LEAs, at 21.
14 That's a total of 15 percent; 135 responses out of 918
15 core contacts.

16 The overall survey results of all of these were:
17 Number one -- facilities were the number one; number two,
18 lower cost option; and tie in number three of business
19 difficulty for recycler/processor, and local ordinances,
20 plans, policies, programs, and procedures.

21 --o0o--

22 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: The first one is the
23 non-regulatory public agencies. Their top three barriers
24 were: Number one, lower cost options, with sub-barriers
25 of cheap disposal; landfill rates may not be lower than

1 processing fees; with grinding materials for biomass or
2 ADC, alternative daily cover; and demolition is cheaper
3 than deconstruction.

4 Their second top three was facilities with
5 sub-barriers of siting difficulties because of noise,
6 dust, traffic, et cetera; too few facilities to handle
7 mixed C&D and drywall, especially in rural areas; and too
8 few last-chance buy-back facilities for salvaged C&D
9 material.

10 Their third top three barrier was business
11 difficulties, with sub-barriers of high operational costs;
12 insufficient markets and unstable commodity prices for
13 some materials; and unpredictable, unreliable C&D material
14 flow.

15 The second group was private solid waste
16 industry.

17 --o0o--

18 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: Their top three barriers --
19 first one was C&D debris processing regulations, with
20 sub-barriers of low permit tier placement thresholds;
21 stigma of being a solid waste handler; and the no residual
22 restriction on C&D-like loads.

23 For number two, there was a tie. The first was
24 CIWMB legislative issues, with sub-barriers of no C&D
25 disposal ban; beneficial reuse competition at landfills;

1 and inconsistent, conflicting, and/or overrestrictive
2 CIWMB regulations, and/or CEQA, California Environmental
3 Quality Act.

4 The second tie was local ordinances, plans,
5 policies, programs, and procedures, with sub-barriers of
6 insufficient building permit diversion deposits; lack of
7 implemented ordinances; long development process;
8 ordinances that don't require reuse; and inadequate
9 ordinance enforcement; and insufficient local economic
10 incentives.

11 Their third barrier was markets, with just two at
12 inadequate markets for hard-to-market materials, and no
13 mandate to use recycled road base.

14 And, finally, regulatory public agencies, their
15 top three barriers were, number one, a tie.

16 --o0o--

17 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: C&D debris processing
18 regulation, was sub-barriers of low permit tier placement
19 thresholds; stigma of being a solid waste handler; and the
20 no residual restriction on C&D-like loads.

21 The other tie was facilities, with sub-barriers
22 of siting difficulties due to noise, traffic, dust, et
23 cetera; and too few C&D material recyclers/processors,
24 especially in rural areas.

25 Number two, we also had a tie with CIWMB

1 legislative issues, sub-barriers; beneficial reuse
2 competition at landfills; and inconsistent, conflicting,
3 and/or overrestrictive regulations, and/or CEQA.

4 The second barrier tie was lower cost options,
5 with sub-barriers of cheap disposal; grinding materials
6 for biomass or alternative daily cover; and demolition is
7 cheaper than deconstruction.

8 The third barrier was business difficulty, with
9 sub-barriers of high operational costs; insufficient
10 markets and unstable commodity prices for some materials;
11 and unpredictable, unreliable C&D material flow.

12 --o0o--

13 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: What we have are the
14 following findings.

15 --o0o--

16 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: Number one, cheaper
17 alternatives may hinder recycling and processing, which is
18 demolition may be less costly than deconstruction, because
19 of: High deconstruction costs; insufficient markets;
20 recyclers/processors that accept reclaimed and recycled
21 material at competitive prices; and unpredictable,
22 unreliable C&D material flow. Also, competitive landfill
23 disposal rates may hinder C&D recycler/processor from
24 removing C&D from the economic mainstream.

25 --o0o--

1 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: The second finding staff
2 found was lack of ordinances or insufficient ordinance
3 implementation. The lack of ordinance implementation or
4 enforcement may discourage an adequate infrastructure for
5 the diversion of C&D material.

6 --o0o--

7 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: The third finding was lack of
8 local economic incentives. Some jurisdictions lack local
9 economic incentives to support deconstruction and C&D
10 diversion. For example, low or non-existent building
11 permit diversion deposits.

12 --o0o--

13 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: The fourth finding was
14 regulatory barriers. Respondents contend aspects of C&D
15 processing regulations may result in higher operational
16 costs and too few C&D material recyclers and processors.
17 But analysis of existing sites doesn't show whether or not
18 the regulations hinder new facilities. CDI material,
19 that's construction, demolition, and inert, may instead go
20 through transfer processing stations and landfills. Also,
21 classifying a C&D debris processor as a solid waste
22 handler rather than recycler may create a negative public
23 image, reducing material flow or causing siting problems.

24 --o0o--

25 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: The fifth finding, lack of

1 facilities. There are too few recycler/processors to
2 handle mixed loads and hard to process C&D material; for
3 example, asphalt roofing and wood shingles, discarded
4 carpet, gypsum wallboard material, organics, wood waste,
5 painted lumber, soil, and stucco.

6 The reasons being: Competition with cheap
7 disposal; high operational costs; insufficient markets and
8 unstable commodity prices for some C&D materials;
9 restrictive state regulations for recycler/processors;
10 severe material fragmentation by demolition; siting
11 difficulties; and unreliable, unpredictable C&D material
12 flow.

13 --o0o--

14 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: The sixth finding was lack of
15 markets. There are no industry-wide specifications to
16 facilitate buying and selling recycled products from C&D
17 materials. Some stakeholders contend that biomass
18 diversion and alternative daily cover are cheaper
19 alternatives that may undermine C&D diversion by
20 encouraging demolition, which is a severe material
21 fragmentation and mixing; over deconstruction; and also
22 reducing the flow of C&D material to C&D recyclers and
23 processors. However, this information is unsubstantiated
24 by CIWMB data as is shown in the next slide.

25 --o0o--

1 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: Here we have alternative
2 daily cover information. As you can see, the columns on
3 the far right are C&D. It's much lower than the total
4 ADC.

5 --o0o--

6 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: And, finally, we have
7 miscellaneous findings. There is no sufficient data on
8 C&D reuse and recycling by local and state agencies. And
9 some stakeholders support a statewide C&D disposal ban, a
10 statewide mandate to use recycled road base, and
11 restrictions on demolition.

12 --o0o--

13 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: For C&D handling sites --
14 this is part of the agenda item also -- we have an
15 accounting of 48 C&D handling sites. We have seven closed
16 C&D handling sites for various issues, as you can see.

17 --o0o--

18 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: And we have 29 existing C&D
19 handling sites. This was prior to August 9th of 2003,
20 which was the effective date of the construction,
21 demolition processing regulations.

22 We have eight that have or will receive small
23 volume CDI debris processing operation EA notifications.

24 Three that have or will receive medium volume CDI
25 debris processing facility registration permits.

1 Five have or will use the CDI debris temporary
2 registration permits for a full permit tier phase-in.

3 Twelve have or will be issued transfer processing
4 solid waste facility permits.

5 And one site changed operations to qualify as a
6 CDI debris recycler.

7 --o0o--

8 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: Now we have twelve new C&D
9 handling sites after the effective date of the
10 regulations.

11 Six have or will receive small volume CDI debris
12 processing operation EA notifications.

13 Three have received medium volume CDI debris
14 processing facility registration permits.

15 One planned site qualifies as a large volume CDI
16 debris processing facility in the full permit tier.

17 One site received a transfer processing permit.

18 And one site is a CDI debris recycler.

19 This concludes the Power Point presentation. Do
20 you have any questions?

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Any questions?

22 Thank you, Allison.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: No.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: So where does that
25 leave us? Now that we have all of this great information,

1 what do we need? Do we have some conclusions now as to

2 what is the next step?

3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEVENSON: We don't have specific

4 recommendations today. But we have worked together, the

5 three deputies and staff. And we have a number of

6 recommendations that we would incorporate into next

7 month's action item plan. Those could be incorporated

8 within various categories, such as procurement related to

9 specifications or assistance to local jurisdictions on

10 ordinances.

11 One point that Mr. Leary has made before is that

12 we need to have a better understanding of the flow of

13 materials of where it's being generated and to what

14 markets. And I want to add one point from the agenda item

15 on that. Our SIWS facility database, the Solid Waste

16 Information System, shows about over 200 active transfer

17 stations that can accept C&D waste and almost another 100

18 landfills that can accept C&D waste. But we don't have

19 data on where that material is really going. So that

20 would be one recommendation that we would incorporate into

21 next month's item, is to get a better handle on where

22 materials are flowing. It's a broader issue than just

23 C&D.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Let me ask you this.

25 Of all of the respondents, how many of those were transfer

1 stations? I don't recall. I don't know whether there
2 was --

3 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: There were two solid waste
4 industry respondents. They were apart from handling C&D
5 mainly.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: So would it behoove us
7 to go back to this particular group of people and maybe do
8 the same survey to find out? Would it help if we go in
9 and target these particular facilities to see how we can
10 improve then?

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEVENSON: I might want to defer
12 to Mark on his thoughts. But I think initially one of our
13 ideas is that we need to get more focused data on how
14 materials are flowing from generation spots to different
15 solid waste and recycling facilities and then into markets
16 both for organics and C&D in general. We would have a
17 much more intense field effort to go out and get that kind
18 of data. Might have to be a contract or staff out in the
19 field. But it'd definitely be going back to some of the
20 same people, but probably an expanded universe to get
21 that.

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Fifteen percent
23 statistically is a really good sample. It should provide
24 us with a very good overall broad state of the state here
25 of where we are. So this is very, very good information.

1 So for me, there are certain things that really jump out
2 as to what is it that we can do. There might be certain
3 things that we can do. And I don't know whether this
4 should be the time or whether we have a little meeting,
5 because I need to know what are the things that you guys
6 are going to be recommending.

7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEVENSON: If you'd like, I think
8 Pat and I and Patty can each give you kind of a broad
9 response on that now and see what your thoughts on that
10 are, and then we can incorporate further details as
11 appropriate in the next item.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Great. I think that
13 would be very helpful.

14 I don't know if we have any speakers. I don't
15 know if anybody wants to speak to this issue.

16 You do. Great, Scott.

17 So let me see. Should we hear from you first?
18 Should we ask Scott to speak? Do we have any more
19 questions here? We'll listen from our great audience.
20 Come on, Scott.

21 MR. SMITHLINE: Thank you, Chair Marin, Committee
22 Member Mulé, and Board Member Peace. I just have a brief
23 comment this morning.

24 These regulations pre-date now most of the Board
25 members, so it's sort of interesting that now they're

1 coming around and there's a new set of people really here
2 to deal with them. But I'm sure you recall that many of
3 the environmental community as well as some of the C&D
4 recycling community opposed these regulations because the
5 tier thresholds were very difficult to comply with. And
6 the Board decided to reject the staff's recommendation.

7 I think this agenda item suggests that the staff
8 came in with 300 tons per day originally. I thought it
9 was actually higher than that for a full permit. But
10 maybe it was only 300. But now it's obviously much lower
11 than that for a full permit.

12 But it is difficult to get these permits. C&D is
13 very heavy stuff. And these regulations were also loaded
14 up with a lot of other items that required C&D recyclers
15 to comply with at other solid waste facilities and to this
16 date still don't have to comply with. I would urge you as
17 you move forward and identify this as a priority to
18 consider keeping on the table possibly adjusting this tier
19 threshold. I think that's something that should stay on
20 the table.

21 You know, I accept the staff's statement that
22 it's too early to tell whether these are really hurting or
23 helping. Perhaps we don't have all that information. But
24 I think from what we see, it's clear that they're not
25 doing a lot to achieve their purpose, which is to increase

1 C&D recycling. We can see people aren't jumping for these
2 permits. At worst, they are inhibiting C&D recycling. So
3 I'm encouraged to hear this has been identified by the
4 Board as a priority. And I just wanted to say I encourage
5 you to keep on the table the possibility of changing those
6 thresholds.

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you, Scott.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Scott, I was involved in
9 the regulation process indirectly when I was in the
10 private sector, so I am somewhat familiar with them. And
11 I do agree with your statement that it seems like it's
12 more difficult to get a C&D processing permit for some
13 folks than it is to get a regular transfer or other. So I
14 know there's been some difficulty.

15 And I tend to agree with you that we want to make
16 it easy for people, but, you know, obviously within the
17 letter of our law. We want to abide by all laws and
18 regulations, but we don't want to inhibit. You know, it's
19 like we've got conflicting processes going on here. We
20 want to increase C&D diversion, yet our permitting process
21 seems to inhibit that. So thank you.

22 MR. SMITHLINE: I am encouraged that it seems you
23 have identified this as a priority and it seems to be
24 coming up with interest.

25 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Actually, that was my

1 number two. My first question was the no residual
2 requirement. I need to find out exactly how that is a
3 major problem for all these people. I think that was
4 pretty consistent.

5 And my second thing was inconsistent or
6 conflicting regulations. That's something that this Board
7 should be able to deal with, whatever it is that is
8 inhibiting -- or people at least say it's a problem. If
9 there is a conflict there between what we're saying and
10 what we're asking them to do, we need to alleviate that.
11 We need to fix that. And maybe we need to put on, you
12 know, our thinking caps and find out what is it. I don't
13 know. I mean, the fact -- this is a general statement,
14 conflicting or inconsistent regulations. I don't know
15 what that means. But it seems to me that is something
16 that we can fix.

17 The waste handler versus a recycler. It seems
18 like there is a stigma attached to that. I don't know
19 whether it is inhibiting from more development of these
20 facilities. And maybe that is something that we should
21 also be able to deal with.

22 My question to us is what can we do? Obviously,
23 the way California's growing, we are going to see a
24 consistent growth in building and construction. We're
25 beginning to have to get ahead of ourselves or actually

1 ahead of the industry and be prepared for this. If we can
2 do something about it from this Board, we should be able
3 to do that.

4 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEVENSON: Well, if I could
5 respond from a couple of perspectives. There's probably
6 three or four major areas that are identified in this
7 survey. One is the status in the regulations and their
8 impact on sites. Another are the market-related issues,
9 and I'll defer to Patty. And another is kind of what
10 local jurisdictions are doing and what kind of assistance
11 we can provide to them. And I'll defer to Pat on that.

12 In terms of the regulations, certainly the
13 development of the C&D current regulations was a long,
14 controversial process. And there were many different
15 proposals brought forth. As Scott indicated, the staff's
16 original proposal was a less stringent kind of tiered
17 structuring.

18 The problem that we have right now is it's not
19 clear to us that the regulations, even if they are
20 difficult, are actually hindering the movement of C&D
21 materials through the solid waste infrastructure into
22 markets. That's why we need to get more information on
23 what's going where through transfer stations.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: But that's just one piece
25 of it. And, again, they're all interrelated. That's

1 right, because, you know, the difficulty in getting a site
2 permitted in conjunction with market development. And,
3 again, all these things need to be looked at collectively.
4 And it's not looking at this piece or that piece. We have
5 to look at the bigger picture and figure out how we're
6 going to address it, you know, on all fronts. I mean,
7 really, that's how we have to approach this.

8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEVENSON: I think you'll hear
9 from Pat and Patty we have ideas that mesh together to
10 address all those. I'm just picking off the one --

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: The one that he can
12 deal with. Just change the entire regulations, how's
13 that?

14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEVENSON: The other issue that
15 Chair Marin brought up is the inconsistencies in the
16 regulations. It is a fact that the Board in adopting the
17 C&D regulations imposed a number of additional conditions,
18 including the residuals requirement, but also a number of
19 other ones. And we are looking at the applicability of
20 some of those requirements, whether or not to apply them
21 to other solid waste regulatory packages so everything is
22 consistent. That's with respect to fire plan and random
23 inspections and three strikes. The residuals condition or
24 provision is very specific to C&D sites. I'll let Allison
25 explain that in a little more detail and the history about

1 that. It's certainly something we can look at in the
2 future.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: I think what's the
4 intent here? You know, we go out there and ask people
5 what are your problems? And then they say, "Your
6 regulations are our problems." And we can't say, "No.
7 We're infallible. Our regulations are perfect."
8 Otherwise, why do we ask them? Why do we have these
9 surveys?

10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEVENSON: With all due respect
11 to the stakeholders, their comments, to me, are
12 conflicting. They indicate there are a number of
13 different barriers, not necessarily related to the
14 regulations. I cannot look at this survey data and
15 honestly tell you that the regulations are a major
16 hindrance.

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Why do they cite that
18 or why do you put it in here? It comes consistently at
19 every single one.

20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEVENSON: Let you know the
21 stakeholders, how they're responding. If you go back to
22 the overall results of the survey, regulations were not in
23 the top three. So it's when they got to the sub-groups
24 that they were identified.

25 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Well, it could also be

1 a scapegoat. But I want to believe -- you know, I believe
2 consistently that people voice their concern, whether
3 perceived or real. If it is perception, if it is, you
4 know, maybe we need to educate them that, in fact, our
5 regulations don't do that. If it's real, then we need to
6 address it. And then it becomes ours to deal with.

7 I'm not here to be defensive. And I don't want
8 any of the staff to be defensive. I mean, we were
9 breaking ground when we were doing this. It's a learning
10 process. If we need to adjust it, if we need to tweak it,
11 then I think we have an obligation to do that. That's why
12 we want their feedback. I don't want anybody to be
13 defensive at all. This is amazing what we're doing. It's
14 a huge challenge. But I believe we need to go out there,
15 and we're on this journey together, the industry, the
16 environmental groups, and ourselves.

17 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEVENSON: I don't disagree with
18 that sentiment at all. I don't want to embark on a
19 regulatory process if it's not needed. So what the
20 survey --

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: I appreciate that.

22 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEVENSON: -- suggests to me is
23 that before we make that decision, we need to get one more
24 step, one more analysis of information about where
25 materials are flowing. Because if they are moving through

1 transfer stations and landfills, then is it a problem in
2 terms of the statewide C&D recycling? Is there something
3 else? If the material is not moving through those
4 facilities and we're not seeing more C&D sites, then we
5 absolutely have a problem. And we need to look at the
6 regulatory structures.

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: That's fair. Okay.

8 Allison, do you want to say something?

9 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: Do you have any questions?

10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: No. Do you want to
11 add?

12 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEVENSON: The residual --

13 MS. SPREADBOROUGH: The residual on the C&D-like
14 was a restriction put on only the registration tier of the
15 CDI debris processing facility. So those medium volume
16 CDI processing facilities have a no-residual in C&D only
17 in that tier, and which essentially means if there's
18 C&D-like which comes from the manufacturer, every bit of
19 it has to be recycled. If something is iffy about being
20 C&D and a load comes in and the materials are recycled
21 100 percent, then the operator is at fault for not making
22 sure that -- should not have accepted the load in the
23 first place. Some people have complained about that.

24 I did want to mention one thing, though. You may
25 have noticed that the overall survey had a different

1 outcome than the three different respondent types. That's
2 because the non-regulatory portion skewed it. There were
3 65 people that responded as one category. They might not
4 be familiar with the C&D regulations. So I'm thinking
5 that might be why the other two came up in their top
6 three, but it didn't overall. So if more people from one
7 respondent group responded, then it would have skewed it a
8 different way.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Okay. All right.
10 Thank you.

11 Patty.

12 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Patty Wohl, Waste
13 Prevention and Market Development.

14 As far as the markets side, we actually have four
15 pretty long-lived programs that are working well for us:
16 the Green Building Program, the Loan Program, CalMAX, and
17 the Reuse Assistance Grants. So what the Market staff
18 proposed is, like on the green building side, that we used
19 to have, you know, green building grants and
20 deconstruction grants, that maybe we revisit that as a way
21 to stimulate the markets.

22 There's a group called Great Green Residential
23 Environmental Action Team that's working on developing
24 model guidelines for residential C&D. We want to get
25 involved with that and work with them and try to shore up

1 that effort. We've talked about working with LEED and
2 raising the bar for what C&D material, what consists of
3 getting a lead silver. You know that the Executive Order
4 has kind of required that all state buildings be built to
5 LEED silver. For every building that we can build, it's a
6 75 percent diversion of C&D. So we want to make an
7 all-out effort in that way.

8 The Reuse Assistance Grants, the history has been
9 22 out of 37 grants have been related to C&D. We've
10 proposed increasing -- you know, we only give out \$250,000
11 a year. We've talked about increasing that amount.

12 On the CalMAX side, 25 percent of the CalMAX
13 matches relate to C&D. And over the life of this program,
14 it's diverted 910,000 tons. That's a huge place for us to
15 be focusing. What we want to look at is revamping that
16 and trying to better quantify the matches and better
17 automate those matches. So we want to just spend some
18 effort there.

19 And then on the loan side, to possibly look at
20 incentives for C&D, you know, some areas like that to do
21 an all-out marketing campaign on our low interest rate
22 loan for those efforts. And then I think the last one we
23 talked about was sort of tied to what Howard has been
24 talking about, that research related to C&D material
25 flows. So our focus in markets was more to try to enhance

1 the programs we know that are working already and infuse
2 some dollars and try to stimulate the markets that way.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: I was just going to say,
5 I mean, have you as a staff looked at specific items such
6 as -- and I think you mentioned it in your survey -- was
7 use of recycled asphalt, you know, and aggregate. I know
8 when we were at the SWANA meeting in Palm Springs, we meet
9 with the folks -- the CMRA people from Dan Copp Recycling
10 in Riverside County. And, you know, his concern is that
11 he's getting all this material -- and you guys are
12 familiar with that. He's getting all the material, but he
13 doesn't have the markets for it.

14 And so one of the suggestions that they made was,
15 you know, maybe if we as an organization, we as staff, go
16 out and educate the local jurisdictions that it's in their
17 best interest to use this product, keep it within their
18 own jurisdictional boundaries. Number one, they're
19 increasing their diversion rate. But number two, you
20 know, they're walking the walk by actually reusing that
21 material. And those are the kinds of things that I'd like
22 to see us focus on more.

23 And so if that can give you just some direction.
24 I mean, that, to me, was just such a great example. And
25 then you can carry that over to RAC and some other

1 materials that are being generated in these jurisdictions.

2 You know, let's be innovative in some of the things we do.

3 Now, are the jurisdictions going to support -- do

4 we want to mandate it? I don't know if we want to do

5 that. I think what we want to do is start out by

6 educating them and being positive and encouraging them to

7 use it and identifying those jurisdictions that are

8 already doing that, and then using them as examples as a

9 best management practice to educate the other

10 jurisdictions.

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: And we actually have that

12 as one of our recommendations. And, in fact, that's one

13 of those that kind of crosses between Pat and I. So we're

14 talking about developing the markets. He's got one that

15 he'd probably like to talk about now, which is kind of

16 encouraging local governments. You know, they push

17 diversion, but they need to push the purchasing piece,

18 too.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Exactly. And that's how

20 I hope that we will continue to work, is cross

21 divisionally and make those connections. And, again, you

22 know, as Rosario says, we're all in this together. You

23 know, our goal is to maximize diversion. It's real

24 simple.

25 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: When we work with the

1 jurisdictions, I want to come up with some incentives
2 where they actually -- and, you know, besides giving them
3 money. And I don't know what that is. There's got to
4 be -- we need to give them a reason why they need to do
5 this, aside from getting their credits and all that. I
6 don't know.

7 Maybe we need to have a small group of city
8 mayors or council members or city engineers or whatever.
9 What would be some incentives we can give them? What
10 would preclude them from not wanting to participate, if
11 you will? What are the disincentives that they have?
12 What are the challenges they're facing? Maybe we can
13 address that with the jurisdictions themselves. I know
14 they're all going to say, "Give us some more money. Give
15 us some grants." I like that. It's always about the
16 money. I'll just go print some more, you know.

17 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Actually, I think that
18 would be a great idea. That would probably do it right
19 there. Print the money, and we'll be done with it. I
20 just want to mention --

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Solve all the
22 problems.

23 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Very creative.

24 On the collection side, what we've seen, we have
25 about 150 jurisdictions who are on SB1066 Time Extensions.

1 Of those, we have about 60 that have come forward to the
2 Board that actually have ordinances in place. There's
3 another 40 that will be coming forward for second
4 extensions, over 40 that will be requesting to be approved
5 for additional ordinances. So the collection side is
6 building.

7 We're seeing more and we continue to promote more
8 regional agencies. And then within that framework what we
9 want to see is more regional facilities, because having
10 the regional agencies get together as well as more County
11 cooperation, we're starting to see a little bit of that.

12 But then tied into that and right now what the
13 barrier is, is dealing with Public Works Departments. And
14 I'm not saying this is universal. But we still have the
15 barriers, some historical information or historical
16 experiences that have existed where there's biases against
17 using this material. And instead of really looking into
18 it, sometimes we just hear it doesn't meet our
19 requirements, that's it. Well, we don't think that's
20 necessary the story. So maybe there's ways we can
21 incrementally -- instead of putting it on primary roads,
22 let's test some of the stuff on some of the secondary
23 roads with communities.

24 As far as the incentives, I think in some cases,
25 you know, you just have to get a sense of what communities

1 are dealing with. And the incentives may be unique to
2 that particular jurisdiction. But you don't know until
3 you start meeting with them and talking with them, getting
4 mayors and elected officials together. That's probably
5 one of the elements you'll see in the plan that will be
6 coming before you next month, is to not only having staff
7 go out and meeting with the elect officials and having
8 forums, but having Board members do so as well. In total
9 support of doing that.

10 We're also, you know, underway with our
11 characterization study looking at transfer stations,
12 disposal facilities, and material recovery facilities to
13 see what the constituents are in that C&D material.
14 That's going to be helpful as well.

15 Our website, we're putting together more
16 materials for jurisdictions on the how to's, who's doing
17 what, peer matching opportunities. So that's going to
18 help quite a bit.

19 We're also looking at having an additional C&D
20 workshop later this year. We had one that was very
21 successfully attended. There was a lot of good
22 information. Want to have another follow-up, again, based
23 on our future experiences.

24 So that's at this point where we are in this.

25 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Okay. Thank you, Pat.

1 Ms. Mulé.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: And I just want to say
3 you had just mentioned it. The lack of infrastructure is
4 an impediment, as you well know. And, again, I can share
5 my experience in Riverside County where there were several
6 jurisdictions that wanted to implement an ordinance, and
7 they would come to the haulers and say, "We want to do
8 this." And the problem was there was no facility to bring
9 mixed loads of C&D.

10 And then when we went out to the customers, the
11 contractors, and said, "How about if we provide you with
12 separate bins for C&D," they just said, "No way. We're
13 not doing it. Our guys are too busy. They're not going
14 to sit there and separate everything out. They're just
15 going to throw it all in one bin." So then everybody was
16 caught in the middle, because we couldn't actually take
17 the mixed loads anywhere to be separated. So it was very
18 frustrating, I know, when I was working down there to try
19 to get this whole thing going.

20 The good news is that infrastructure is being
21 developed. But as we know, and Pat and I have talked
22 about this several times, it's going to take time to get
23 that infrastructure developed. We got a city in the high
24 desert that's working on it. Hopefully, they'll be open
25 by July of this year. But how long did it take them to

1 get that infrastructure developed?

2 So I think if we all recognize all these facts,
3 that it's going to take a while, but we're getting there.
4 And then combine that with some of these other
5 recommendations that staff is working on, you know, I
6 think we can make some positive impacts.

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: I'm actually very
8 encouraged. It seems like sometimes we take one step and
9 then we have to take two steps back. But we're actually
10 moving. And it seems to me we're taking two steps. We
11 take one step back and we're going to take two steps, and
12 we will move.

13 Did you want to say something?

14 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Howard mentioned he wants to
15 do another study on material flow to show if the
16 regulations are really what's hindering the C&D, you know,
17 processing situation. When do you plan to do that, or
18 when will you know?

19 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEVENSON: I think that's
20 something that we as Executive staff have to discuss prior
21 to bringing the item to you next month in terms of what is
22 the scope of that. Does it go beyond C&D to encompass
23 other materials? And exactly how much will we have to
24 spend on that?

25 But, presumably, if we brought that in an item

1 and you directed us to do that, it would be something we
2 would be able to do later this year as soon as we could
3 get that in place.

4 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: I guess --

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEVENSON: If it's a contract,
6 it's going to take a little longer to get in place. If
7 it's staff, that takes staff resources to go out and do
8 that kind of survey.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: That was part of what we
10 had discussed at our Board retreat, was to do that market
11 infrastructure analysis and do it like on a regional basis
12 to see where materials are going and where the markets are
13 and what markets are lacking.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Mr. Leary, you
15 promised us something; right?

16 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR LEARY: I'm sorry. I promised
17 what?

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: You promised us
19 something regarding market and --

20 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR LEARY: What retreat?

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: The retreat.

22 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR LEARY: I'm teasing, of
23 course, Madam Chair. I don't want to cut short Member
24 Peace's questions. But this is clearly all going to role
25 up into the action plan that we conceived of in the

1 retreat and we'll bring forward to you next month.

2 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: I just have to say, you
3 know, I was on the Board. I was a new member on the Board
4 during all this, the regulations development. And it was
5 very, very controversial. And what was finally passed
6 didn't make a lot of sense to me, from the low tiers to
7 the no residual requirement. So even with or without the
8 material flow study, some of these just don't make sense
9 to me. And I personally would like to see some of the
10 regulations changed to more reflect what staff had
11 originally recommended. And so I don't know how we move
12 in that direction, how hard that would be. I know Howard
13 said he didn't want to go through a whole regulation
14 change at this point.

15 But even with all these studies, I mean, some of
16 the things in the C&D regulations just didn't make sense,
17 from some of the things that were required in the C&D
18 regulations that weren't required in the transfer
19 processing -- like I said, the no residual requirement,
20 like what Board Member Mulé said. Some people don't want
21 it if there's any sort of stuff that's mixed in there.
22 They don't even want to take it because of that
23 requirement.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Well, we have our work
25 cut out for us. But I believe -- more so than anything

1 else, I believe that we're ready for the challenge. And I
2 thank all of you and especially the three of you that
3 worked together. We'll deal with this, you know. I
4 believe we're bigger than the obstacles before us. So
5 we'll meet the challenge.

6 Thank you, Howard. Thank you, Patty. Thank you,
7 Pat. Oh, I'm sorry. Allison.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Can't forget Allison.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you to all of
10 your staff who I know worked very hard on this. With
11 that, everybody else is dismissed.

12 Pat, you're going to continue; right?

13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: I'd like to go ahead
14 and list these by the Committee item letter, rather than
15 Board number. So we'll go ahead and start with Item C.
16 And this is Consideration of the Amended Nondisposal
17 Facility Element for the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles
18 County. And Steve Uselton will present this item.

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Who's that Steve
20 Uselton?

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: He's some guy from the
22 south.

23 SUPERVISOR USELTON: Good morning. The City of
24 Los Angeles has amended its NDFE by identifying and
25 describing California Waste Services. This is an existing

1 facility that is required to be permitted under the
2 Board's recently adopted C&D regulations. This is the
3 third amendment that the City has made to its originally
4 approved Nondisposal Facility Element. The facility is a
5 large volume construction, demolition, and inert debris
6 processing facility which accepts material from Orange and
7 Los Angeles Counties. The facility is located in the City
8 of Los Angeles.

9 And that concludes my presentation.

10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Okay. Any questions?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: No, Madam Chair.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Any problems? No.

13 Actually, I have no problems.

14 Thank you, Steve. And I know who you are. He's
15 my partner in the office in Long Beach.

16 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item E is Consideration
17 of the Application for an SB1066 Time Extension by the
18 City of Madera, Madera County. And Natalie Lee will
19 present this item.

20 MS. LEE: Good morning, Committee and Board
21 members. The City of Madera has requested a time
22 extension through December 31st, 2005. The specific
23 reasons the City needs a time extension are as follow.
24 The city has one of the highest growth rate counties in
25 the state. The significant level of residential and

1 commercial growth have impacted all existing services,
2 including the waste management sector. The City of Madera
3 is addressing the needed changes with limited budgets and
4 very limited staff resources.

5 Growth in the city and county and variations in
6 the waste stream coming into the county's materials
7 recovery facility and landfill have impacted the
8 processing programs at both of these facilities. There
9 was an efficiency study done in 2003 which identified
10 these limitations in efficiency, and the landfill and
11 operator are looking to make improvements in these
12 programs.

13 A permit revision that will allow new and
14 expanded programs and facilities is pending and should be
15 complete in mid-2005. The City will review the existing
16 service agreements to maximize diversion under new
17 agreements or will move to a facility which can provide
18 adequate services.

19 The City has undergone numerous staff and
20 management changes in the last two years which have
21 effected the time frames for development and
22 implementation of programs. The City anticipates a 9
23 percent increase in diversion through the proposed plan of
24 correction.

25 Board staff have determined that the information

1 submitted in the application is adequately documented and
2 is recommending that the Board approve the time extension
3 request for the City as submitted with the addition of one
4 program to the plan of correction. Staff recommends that
5 the program to be added will be the development and formal
6 adoption of a recycled content procurement policy by the
7 City. A representative from the City is present to answer
8 any questions. This concludes my presentation.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Okay. Thank you. We
10 have some questions for the representative. Oh, you don't
11 have any questions. Okay. No questions for the
12 representative. And no questions for you.

13 But I'm glad that the work plan has already
14 been -- you want to come talk to us for a second? Oh,
15 she's with the next item. You're not from the City of
16 Madera. Let me put on my glasses. Oh, you are not from
17 the City of Madera. Okay.

18 No. I'm glad that everything is working out, and
19 I appreciate that. I like this. We can't vote on it.
20 Thank you very, very much.

21 That takes us to the next item.

22 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yasmin Satter will
23 present Item F, which is Consideration of the Application
24 for an SB1066 Time Extension by the City of Stockton, San
25 Joaquin County.

1 MS. SATTER: I was too excited about my item

2 so --

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: And here I am sending
4 you to Madera. That is not nice. Thank you.

5 MS. SATTER: Good morning, Committee members.

6 The City of Stockton has requested a 1066 Time
7 Extension through December 31st, 2005. The specific
8 reasons the City needs their time extension are to
9 establish and implement a new franchise agreement with new
10 and expended programs that are anticipated to take full
11 effect within one year after implementation and are as
12 follows.

13 Beginning June 2004, the City started
14 implementation of a new three-cart collection program for
15 all residential and commercial generators.

16 Beginning June 2004, the City initiated
17 requirements that all commercial and industry haulers
18 divert 50 percent of material collected.

19 In addition, the City also passed a construction
20 and demolition debris ordinance requiring all construction
21 and demolition contractors to divert 50 percent of all
22 project waste generated.

23 The City anticipates an 11 percent increase in
24 its diversion through these programs. Board staff has
25 determined that the information submitted in the

1 application is adequately documented. Based on this
2 information, Board staff is recommending that the Board
3 approve the City's time extension request. A
4 representative from the City, Mike Miller, is present to
5 answer any questions you might have.

6 This concludes my presentation.

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Okay. Is the
8 representative from the City here? I was really taken by
9 your -- well, go ahead. Tell us who you are.

10 MR. MILLER: Mike Miller. I'm solid waste
11 manager for the City of Stockton.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you. I was
13 really interested in your curbside for food waste.

14 MR. MILLER: Okay. Sure. We're excited about
15 it.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Is that already in
17 place, or is that something --

18 MR. MILLER: Yes. It's in place. And, actually,
19 we're expanding it in June 2006 to include meat and fish.
20 It now includes vegetables, fruits, dairy products,
21 grains. And it's going to be expanded to include --

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: And this is city-wide?

23 MR. MILLER: Yes.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: I want to go to his
25 city. I was really taken. I think that's pretty

1 innovative.

2 MR. MILLER: We have about 68,000 residential
3 accounts. And all of them are eligible -- or actually is
4 part of the package they get when they -- for garbage
5 service.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Wow. Well, I have no
7 problem with this. But where are you taking -- once you
8 take all of this, where does it actually go?

9 MR. MILLER: Okay. We have two franchisees,
10 Waste Management, Stockton Scavenger. They cover the east
11 side of town. And on the west side of town is Allied
12 Waste Sunrise Sanitation. Waste Management takes their
13 materials, the green waste, to the city of Modesto's
14 composting site. And Sunrise Sanitation, they take theirs
15 to -- they own Forward Landfill. They take it there, and
16 they use it. They grind it up and use it for alternative
17 daily cover currently.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Excellent.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: I just had one question,
20 Mike. I noticed here that in 2000 you were at 49 percent;
21 2001 at 51 percent; and then in 2002, you went to 46
22 percent.

23 MR. MILLER: Right.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Is the 46 -- when you saw
25 that 46 percent, is that what caused you to go to the 1066

1 Time Extension?

2 MR. MILLER: I think that that made it -- that
3 really was a decisive factor, yes. It was not a surprise
4 to us that our disposal was climbing. We've experienced a
5 lot of growth in Stockton. And we've known for many years
6 that we needed to make changes. And our City Council,
7 fortunately, had the courage to make those changes.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: I guess I'm a little
9 perplexed, because you were above 50 percent in 2001. And
10 I guess if I were sitting in your shoes and I was at 49
11 and then 51 and then I dropped one year, I would say,
12 well, maybe we shouldn't rush to a 1066 Time Extension.
13 It could have been an anomaly for that year. Again, I
14 don't know the particulars of your community. So I'm
15 trying to understand --

16 MR. MILLER: No. There was a pattern of
17 increasing disposal for the year. We knew what we had to
18 do.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: So you were kind of
20 looking forward, anticipating what the future would hold.
21 Because, again, that's, I think, one of the shortcomings
22 of this system is we're two years, three years in arrears
23 on knowing where we're at. So I'm just -- so based on
24 your knowledge of current disposal trends, you felt that
25 it was in the city's best interest to request the time

1 extension?

2 MR. MILLER: Exactly. In our new franchise
3 agreements, we really took the opportunity to make some
4 wholesale changes in our program that we needed to make,
5 probably the most significant of which was we included the
6 commercial. Commercial is about 79 percent of our waste
7 stream. And we included that in the franchises and made
8 that subject to 50 percent diversion requirement. Prior
9 to that, it had been unregulated by the City. It was open
10 market. And we didn't have -- had no control whatsoever
11 where that waste went. So that was probably the most
12 significant thing. And I knew that it's going to take a
13 while for that to take effect. But we're quite confident
14 that we'll easily get over the 50.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: I think you will, too.
16 Good job. Thank you.

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you, Mr. Miller.
18 I appreciate that. And I'm going to come and visit your
19 city one of these days very, very soon. Because I just --
20 you know, sometimes when I go and visit something, then I
21 go and tell the world what I just visited. And if you
22 guys are able to do it, then the other people should be
23 able to do it and follow your good lead there.

24 MR. MILLER: We'd love to have you come.

25 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you very much.

1 Okay. The next item is --

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item G is Consideration
3 of the Application for an SB1066 Time Extension by the
4 City of Chino, San Bernardino County. And Rebecca Brown
5 is presenting.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: I won't send you to
7 Madera either.

8 MS. BROWN: The City of Chino has also requested
9 a time extension through December 31st, 2005. The reasons
10 the City needs a time extension are to implement programs
11 as outlined in their first extension, which are conducting
12 a survey to determine which commercial accounts are
13 currently using the hauler's recycling services. The City
14 will refocus and increase its commercial sector diversion
15 efforts based on the results of that survey. If the
16 resulting increase in diversion is not significant, the
17 City will negotiate with its waste hauler to further
18 expand commercial recycling.

19 The City and its waste hauler will be working
20 with seven private schools and the Chaffey College
21 satellite campus to implement recycling programs to
22 increase diversion from those school sites.

23 The City and its waste hauler are also conducting
24 a review of multi-family accounts to determine whether
25 additional complexes can be added to the curbside

1 recycling program and will add those complexes to the
2 program to increase diversion in that sector.

3 And, last, the City and hauler are initiating
4 outreach efforts to inform properties in the residential
5 and commercial sector about recycling opportunities, with
6 a particular focus on self-haul construction and
7 demolition debris.

8 The City is analyzing the most effective way of
9 ensuring and documenting diversion of construction and
10 demolition debris without stifling the current voluntary
11 recycling efforts. The City of Chino anticipates a 7
12 percent increase in its diversion rate.

13 Board staff has determined that the information
14 submitted in the application is adequately documented.
15 And based upon this information, Board staff is
16 recommending that the Board approve the time extension
17 request. A representative from the City is here to answer
18 any of your questions.

19 This concludes my presentation.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you.

21 Questions?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Who's here from Chino?

23 MS. BROWN: Marcia Godwin.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Hi. I don't think I met
25 you when I was working with the City on this.

1 I just want to say, Madam Chair, the City of
2 Chino has experienced -- come on up, because I think you
3 can address this better than I.

4 The city has explosive growth, plus they've
5 annexed. They've had several annexations over the last
6 few years. And the third piece of this is there was a
7 problem with illegal haulers coming in and hauling some of
8 the C&D and other materials. And so, again, it was
9 difficult for the city to get a handle on what was truly
10 being disposed of in their community. And, you know,
11 these illegal haulers may have said a load was from Chino,
12 when, in fact, it was from another community. That along
13 with -- I don't know if you're working with the Chino, the
14 men's prison and the other facilities there. Is that part
15 of your analysis?

16 MS. BROWN: Yes. There are already diversion
17 programs occurring at those facilities.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Because I think they
19 could be large sources of diversion. And I just hope that
20 we're maximizing what we're doing.

21 But I can say I know that the City is trying
22 their best to do this. And I commend you for requesting
23 the time extension. I know you'll continue to move
24 forward and do good work.

25 MS. GODWIN: I would just simply confirm that

1 information. The men's prison, the California Institution
2 for Men, has been in the city limits of the City of Chino.
3 Two additional state correctional facilities were part of
4 the rather large annexations. And what was commonly
5 referred to as the Chino Dairy or Agricultural Preserve,
6 but actually included parts that are now in -- that have
7 been in Riverside County and also part of the City of
8 Ontario. And approximately 20 percent of the City's waste
9 stream is self-haul through these facilities, and in some
10 cases construction, demolition debris.

11 We do have waste that is disposed in six
12 different counties and four primary counties where we're
13 at the intersection. And, yes, it's a growing community.
14 And with annexations, one somewhat smaller one in 1999
15 that didn't affect achievement of the 2000 diversion goal,
16 and a much larger one mid-2003. So in addition to the
17 enhancements of programs that were mentioned, we're
18 working on a new base year study as well because the
19 composition of the city is so different now.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: I only have one
21 question. The seven schools that you guys are working
22 with, they didn't have a recycling program established?
23 Or how is it that you're working with them?

24 MS. GODWIN: It may be as much a matter of
25 documenting their existing efforts and formalizing. The

1 public school district does have recycling programs in
2 place in all the public schools. And as we were looking
3 for ways to build on our existing programs, it did seem to
4 be a logical next step to go to the private schools as
5 well. And we have a growing satellite campus with the
6 community college as well, which is another area to
7 enhance recycling.

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: And last, but not
9 least, you anticipate Chino to continue to grow insofar as
10 more houses, more apartment buildings, and so forth? The
11 reason why I'm asking that specifically with the multi
12 unit construction, I was just talking yesterday -- I was
13 meeting with Assemblywoman Cindy Montanez. And she wanted
14 to put in statute a requirement for recycling at the
15 multi-unit facilities. And one of the best times to do it
16 is when they're being built. So there may be the great
17 desire by current facilities and owners of all of these
18 properties to recycle, but they have not built in the
19 space for the bins that -- the various bins that it would
20 require.

21 And so I'm suggesting -- because if I remember
22 how Chino is developing, there's still some room to grow.
23 And I would very much -- instead of having or waiting
24 until the Legislature mandates that, that maybe you talk
25 to your City Council and begin to be very -- unless you

1 already have that, you already have that as a requirement
2 for new construction to have the ability to recycle on the
3 side. Do you have that?

4 MS. GODWIN: Well, I first worked for the City
5 when we first started curbside recycling. I actually
6 personally went out to every multi-family complex in the
7 community. It is a relatively small portion of the
8 residential sector. And there are portions of the
9 agriculture preserve that are master planned for
10 development. And we're meeting monthly on how to design
11 the enclosures and vehicle access in great detail.

12 And there's one project that's master planned, I
13 believe, through property with the men's prison. And
14 there recently was an opening of a consortium of
15 developers, but we're definitely meeting on a regular
16 basis on all those issues.

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: I appreciate that very
18 much. I know Ms. Mulé wants to give you kudos for that.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Again, Chino, I can't say
20 enough good things about this City. When I was with the
21 franchise hauler, they would actually come to us. And
22 they initiated this system, if you will, or this procedure
23 where they would forward us all the site plans. And so we
24 would review the site plans and meet with the City's
25 planning department and with the developer to make sure

1 there was adequate space for carts, systems in
2 single-family residences, for example, and commercial
3 developments as well. So, again, the City really, they're
4 doing all the right things. They really are. They're
5 trying their best.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: You get points for
7 trying. How's that?

8 The next item.

9 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Rebecca will be
10 presenting Item H, which is Consideration of a Second Time
11 Extension Application by the City of Ontario, San
12 Bernardino County, and City of Santee in San Diego County.

13 MS. BROWN: The cities of Ontario and Santee have
14 requested a second time extension through December 31st,
15 2005.

16 The reasons why the City of Ontario has requested
17 a second time extension are: To allow time to expand its
18 non-residential sector diversion and outreach programs;
19 expand large venue diversion programs at the convention
20 center, the airport, and the area race track; and to
21 enforce and expand the construction, demolition inerts
22 ordinance; establish a database to track that diversion;
23 and train City staff to implement the ordinance.

24 This additional time will also allow the City's
25 new staff to carry out their duties that include

1 implementing the construction and demolition ordinance,
2 conducting waste assessments at businesses, and
3 implementing the private hauler permitting program. The
4 City anticipates an 11 percent increase in its diversion
5 rate.

6 The specific reasons why the City of Santee has
7 requested its second time extension are as follows: To
8 implement the construction and demolition diversion
9 ordinance that requires residents and contractors to
10 divert C&D waste from the landfill; for the City and the
11 City's franchise hauler to work with construction projects
12 to make sure they take advantage of local C&D recycling
13 opportunities. And the City anticipates a 3 percent
14 increase in their diversion rate.

15 Board staff has determined that the information
16 submitted in the applications is adequately documented.
17 And based on this information, Board staff recommends that
18 the Board approve the time extension requests for the two
19 cities. There are representatives from the City of
20 Ontario present.

21 This concludes my presentation. Thank you.

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you, Rebecca.

23 Is there anybody from the City of Ontario here?
24 Because I want to tell you something really good about
25 Ontario.

1 MR. JESKE: I'm Ken Jeske, the Director of Public
2 Works and Community Services. And with me is Carey Dale,
3 one of our managers that's helping with the solid waste
4 program. We call it the Integrated Waste Program now, by
5 the way. And if we thought Chino was a growing area, come
6 visit Ontario. In fact, the entire Inland Empire area
7 right now is creating one-third of all the jobs in
8 California.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Amazing. Amazing. I
10 want to know more about your NASCAR and the airport
11 because --

12 MR. JESKE: It's interesting to hear that,
13 because the race track is not in Ontario. So I think that
14 was a misnomer in the staff report. The race track is
15 actually in the sphere of influence of the City of
16 Fontana. That's why you hear it referred to as the
17 Fontana Speedway. And is currently in the Unincorporated
18 County of San Bernardino area.

19 So we have a lot of spillover businesses that
20 fits into our business recycling program that we're
21 kicking off. In fact, our City Council just adopted a new
22 rate schedule that was effective on the first of this
23 month to give a rate break for business recycling programs
24 that they think will help meet these goals quite a bit.

25 But other than the spinoff businesses, that which

1 is generated off the race track is not counted by our
2 City.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: What about the Ontario
4 airport. What is it that you're attempting to do there?

5 MR. JESKE: The airport is actually owned by the
6 City of Los Angeles. It's not owned by the City of
7 Ontario. We have periodically held work with them, and
8 they do have an in-house recycling program for the
9 facilities that are operated by Los Angeles World
10 Airports. I couldn't tell you as I stand here their exact
11 percentage, because they vary pretty dramatically as they
12 built their new terminals.

13 Then on airport property, as regulated by the
14 FAA, you have a number of other airport-related land uses.
15 And we do provide service to those other airport-related
16 land uses, which is part of our Business and Industrial
17 Recycling Program. There's a lot of private businesses
18 there, such as FedEx and UPS and a whole host of operating
19 terminals.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Okay. So how is it
21 that it landed on this report?

22 MS. BROWN: I beg your pardon?

23 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: How is it that all
24 this landed in this report? Is it counted toward their --

25 MS. BROWN: In regard to the area race track,

1 there are multiple jurisdictions impacted by the high
2 volume of people who visit the race track. So there is
3 waste generated directly at the race track that is not
4 counted towards the City. But many of those people use
5 the hospitality services provided in Ontario, Fontana, and
6 Rancho Cucamonga. So with all of those cities and the
7 County, we have been trying to see if there couldn't be a
8 joint effort to work together to address the impacts that
9 those hundreds of thousands of people have on the hotels
10 and the restaurants, transportation, and the airport.

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Okay.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: I just have one question,
13 Ken. The City currently does their own hauling; correct?

14 MR. JESKE: That is correct. We do our own
15 hauling. We do have several contracts for what we do with
16 the materials once we've picked it up and haul it, one
17 with Waste Management and one with Burrtec Waste
18 Industries. And we're negotiating another one with the
19 C&D facility. We're in the process of doing that now.

20 When the comment was made referring to a program
21 to "permit" haulers under City authority and City
22 ordinance, we're referring to private recyclers that are
23 outside of the waste stream regulation, but we can still
24 require them to report to us what they're doing.

25 That whole area around what is now the Fontana

1 Speedway, and historically was the Kaiser Steel Mill, has
2 a tremendous amount of small recycling industries. And
3 getting numbers on what they're doing has been very
4 difficult for all the surrounding jurisdictions.

5 We also have a lot of experience working with
6 multi-family and with the growing community. We're in the
7 process right now of planning, an addition to the city of
8 110,000 people. We're using the new urban concepts that
9 come out of the Urban Planning League and, in fact, with
10 the blessing of the Sierra Club is another, is how we're
11 trying to do responsible growth instead of urban and
12 suburban sprawl.

13 We find that mixing a solid waste and recycling
14 system into that type of unit building is very difficult.
15 We currently have standards for bins -- for commercial
16 bins and multi-family projects. The difficulty is we
17 virtually had to abandon the commingled recycling bin
18 because it had such excessive contamination from the
19 residents that nobody would take it and ended up going
20 into the transfer station as waste anyway. So there's a
21 lot of challenges that we have to work with, and
22 particularly in that higher-density multi-family area.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: The problem with
24 multi-family is that you have many times a transient
25 population.

1 And, again, I would just like to emphasize, Madam
2 Chair, this is not an issue just here in California. It's
3 an issue everywhere. Really, what it takes is extensive
4 outreach and public education and the constant monitoring.
5 And it's a job that never ends.

6 So you've got job security, if that's what you
7 do. Trust me. I did that myself, you know, when I used
8 to work in the private sector.

9 And, again, the multi-family sectors is very
10 difficult. So that's why I'll be very interested in
11 hearing more about Assembly Bill 399, because there are
12 going to be some huge challenges if we mandate that
13 multi-family complexes recycle. There's just so many
14 issues.

15 And I, like you, Madam Chair, like to use the
16 incentive based as opposed to mandating. Let's see what
17 we can do to incentivize them and encourage them to
18 recycle.

19 And I know as a fast-growing community, as is the
20 rest of the Inland Empire, I think you've got a huge
21 opportunity with your commercial base. So hopefully you
22 can expand on what you're already doing there.

23 MR. JESKE: Despite the rapid growth, we haven't
24 backslid. Every year, our percentage is getting better.
25 I think that contributes to staff recommending the

1 additional year. We appreciate working with your staff.

2 They've been very good to work with.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you very much.

4 You know, Pat, one of the things I was thinking,

5 as we see some of the areas in the state where the

6 demographics growth is so huge, those should be our prime

7 targeted areas for providing incentives for those

8 jurisdictions or those businesses that would seek to do

9 C&D recycling. That should be a very clear objective

10 where we identify those areas where there's enormous

11 growth and we anticipate to have growth. So thank you.

12 What's the next item?

13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Terri Edwards is going

14 to present Item I --

15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Wait a minute. Sorry.

16 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: When I heard second time

17 extensions, my antennas always go up. But I was just

18 wondering why the City of Ontario and the City of Santee

19 were lumped together in one item.

20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: We've started doing

21 that for the last six or seven months that where we have

22 staff that are working with multiple jurisdictions, we put

23 them in one agenda item to save staff time and Board time.

24 Just an efficiency thing. The information is all the

25 same. It's all there. It's all presented.

1 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: There might be some
2 questions on one and not the other.

3 Is somebody from the City of Santee here?
4 Nobody's here. Because I had some questions on them.
5 Maybe staff can answer to for me.

6 It said the City of Santee needed additional time
7 to allow the City Council to adopt a C&D ordinance. Do
8 they have any idea when that's going to happen?

9 MR. POULSON: They're in the process right now of
10 running -- I'm Zane Poulson from the Office of Local
11 Assistance.

12 They're in the process right now of actually
13 putting that together. And they have drafts they put
14 together. And they're getting ready within the next
15 couple months to bring that forward to their City Council
16 to look at adoption of that. They're really pushing hard
17 to get that done within the next couple of months.

18 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: That's another community
19 that's booming and ready to grow. So they really need to
20 get that going.

21 Do you know if they're talking about a voluntary
22 system or mandatory system?

23 MR. POULSON: I don't know the specifics. They
24 do have -- they're working from a draft that was put
25 together by the entire County and the SANDAG, San Diego

1 Association of Governments put together, and that would
2 have mandatory requirements. So that's the draft they're
3 working from. But I don't know the specifics of what they
4 will actually have when it's finalized.

5 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: When you look at things, you
6 also look at whether the communities use like the recycled
7 road base and stuff like that in their communities.
8 Because I guess I had a couple -- I talked to a couple of
9 construction people down in the Santee area. They were
10 saying that the city has a pile of rubble and stuff all
11 over their city that they could use for road base and
12 different things, but the City won't let them do that. Do
13 you know anything?

14 MR. POULSON: I don't know specifics. I know
15 they are doing a new base year and that does include
16 recycling of road base that they have. So I do know they
17 use some, because in their new base years, as they were
18 quantifying that, they had contractors that do the road
19 construction and use that recycle road base. But I don't
20 know specifically about --

21 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: The construction companies I
22 talked to said it wasn't allowed.

23 BRANCH MANAGER MORGAN: Board Member Peace, I
24 believe that is changing. We did get some new information
25 from the City of Santee. And our understanding is that

1 the City Council members are extremely supportive of using
2 the recycled aggregate. And I understand just recently a
3 project -- and I'm not sure what road area it was -- the
4 construction company was able to use the recycled Class 2
5 base. So I think things are changing. So we appreciate
6 the message.

7 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: That's good to hear. Thank
8 you.

9 BRANCH MANAGER MORGAN: Cara Morgan, Office of
10 Local Assistance.

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: All right. Thank you
12 so very much. You know, it will always happen. The one
13 City that is not here, that's the one that we're not going
14 to give them the permit; right? No. Just in case Santee
15 is listening, there should be no problem with that
16 extension. Just in case. We don't know. They may be
17 listening through the Internet.

18 Okay. That leads us to the City of Kerman.

19 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: I'm sure they're
20 booking a flight up for the Board meeting now.

21 Terri Edwards is going to present the second time
22 extension application for Kerman in Fresno County.

23 MS. EDWARDS: Good morning, Committee members.

24 The City of Kerman has requested an SB1066 Time
25 Extension through December 31st, 2005. The specific

1 reasons the City needs a time extension are as follows:
2 To expand the City's recycling programs for diversion of
3 residential waste. Expansion to these diversion programs
4 will be supported by education and outreach efforts to
5 residents; and the restructuring of the current collection
6 system, such as coordinating waste and recycling
7 collection days to fall on the same day; and examining the
8 feasibility of switching to a commingled system.

9 The City will introduce a construction and
10 demolition ordinance to its Council for their approval and
11 implement a construction and demolition recycling program.
12 The City will also introduce a commercial recycling
13 program by offering recycling services to 20 businesses
14 that were identified during the last 1066 as businesses
15 that would benefit from such services. The City
16 anticipates a 17 percent increase in its diversion rate
17 with the implementation of program enhancements described
18 in the time extension request.

19 Board staff has determined that the information
20 submitted in the application is adequately documented.
21 Based on this information, Board staff is recommending the
22 Board approve the City's time extension request. A
23 representative from the City is available to answer any
24 questions.

25 This concludes my presentation. Thank you.

1 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you. And who's
2 the representative from the City?

3 MS. EDWARDS: Ron Manfredi. He's here.

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: And you must speak
5 Spanish.

6 MR. MANFREDI: I'm Ron Manfredi, City Manager for
7 the City of Kerman.

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you for coming.
9 We really appreciate it.

10 I was impressed with the fact that you're doing a
11 lot of your outreach in Spanish.

12 MR. MANFREDI: Yes, we are. About 60 percent of
13 our community is hispanic. And we are also considering
14 some outreach in Sikh, which is a large growing percentage
15 of the Punjabi population, about 11 or 12 percent.

16 Interesting to note that during the earlier
17 proceedings I said, "You know, they might ask me a
18 question about asphalt," so I went out and called my city
19 engineer. And I said, "Gary, I know we're doing
20 something, but what are we doing?" And part of our
21 problem, I think, has been appropriate documentation and
22 follow through.

23 You talk about rapid growth. We're in the same
24 situation. We've doubled our population -- more than
25 doubled in my ten years plus with the City.

1 And so we don't have a problem in that area of
2 asphalt, because we put into our specs that if the
3 contractor meets a higher standard, it can be used for
4 road base. If they don't want to meet that standard or
5 they can't meet that standard, then we use it to reinforce
6 our wastewater treatment ponds and our paths and roads
7 around our drainage systems.

8 Where we've had a problem is two-fold. First of
9 all, the accounting or recordkeeping system from the
10 county landfill, both they and we determined was
11 inadequate, because when you're in a rural area -- we're
12 about 18 miles west of Fresno. We call ourselves the
13 jewel to the west side. And in this aspect, you have a
14 zip code that encompasses a larger area than the
15 incorporated city. And until recently, there was not a
16 required pickup system in the county. So there was a lot
17 of self-haul. So when you would ask someone where they
18 were from, you would say Kerman from about a 15-mile,
19 20-mile radius. But now they have a GIS system, global
20 information system, where they can better track that.

21 Also, the county recently passed a C&D ordinance,
22 but we haven't gone back to see how well that's working.
23 So we will -- we have informed our contracting,
24 construction community of that. But we haven't sat down
25 with them and the County to see how well that's all

1 working. Up until recently, we only had two major
2 contractors. But because we're population booming like
3 everybody else is in the central valley, now we have six
4 to eight ones. And we will have to go back and do a
5 better job of tracking that.

6 Mainly, our problem has been with our rapid
7 growth, the staff to keep up. We've recently allocated
8 part of an individual's time to assist me with that. So I
9 don't have to wear quite as many hats.

10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Good.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Thank you for all your
12 work. Thank you for being here today.

13 MR. MANFREDI: Special thanks to Terri for
14 walking us through this.

15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you very much,
16 and good luck. And come back and increase your diversion
17 to 100 percent.

18 Okay. Next item.

19 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: J is Consideration of
20 the Petition for Sludge Diversion Credit and to Change the
21 Base Year to 2003 for the City of Fairfield, Solano
22 County. And Betty Fernandez will present this item.

23 MS. FERNANDEZ: Good morning, Committee Chair and
24 Members.

25 The City of Fairfield has submitted a request to

1 change its base year from 1999 to 2003. This request
2 includes a City petition for sludge diversion credit. The
3 City originally submitted a new base year request with a
4 diversion rate of 71 percent. As part of the base year
5 study review, Board staff conducted a detailed on-site
6 verification visit. As a result of Board staff's review,
7 we recommend a revised diversion rate of 65 percent for
8 the base year 2003.

9 Board staff has also thoroughly reviewed the
10 City's petition for sludge diversion credit and concluded
11 that the City has demonstrated compliance with the
12 applicable statutory conditions. Board staff has
13 determined that the information for both the new base year
14 and the City's petition for sludge diversion credit are
15 adequately documented. Therefore, Board staff is
16 recommending Option 3 of the agenda item, which would
17 approve the revised base year and staff recommendations,
18 as well as approve the petition for sludge diversion
19 credit. A representative from the City is available if
20 you have any questions.

21 This concludes my presentation.

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you, Betty.

23 I have a couple questions. Who's the
24 representative from the City?

25 MS. BENNETT: Good morning, Tammy Bennett, City

1 of Fairfield.

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Yes. Thank you for
3 coming. Your diversion rate is really, really good.

4 MS. BENNETT: Thank you.

5 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: I appreciate that. It
6 helps the entire state when cities do a really good job.
7 And we want you to increase it.

8 MS. BENNETT: We're very pleased to have a
9 Budweiser factory who is a multiple recipient of the WRAP
10 Award. So we're very grateful for that, that they helped
11 us in meeting that diversion. But we don't want that to
12 overshadow all the efforts that Fairfield has made over
13 the last years, especially since 2002 when we had our new
14 hauler agreement go into place. And we also have food
15 waste on the curb. That's something we're really proud of
16 as well.

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: I want to come see it,
18 too. Is the Jelly Bean --

19 MS. BENNETT: The Jelly Belly Factory is there as
20 well. We have a very well-balanced industrial,
21 commercial, residential community in Fairfield.

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Tell me about the
23 sludge. Is anyone opposing that?

24 MS. BENNETT: To my knowledge, no one is opposing
25 it. Again, that was something we came across at last

1 minute. That's not something that I typically deal with
2 directly. So if we have too many questions about it, I'm
3 going to have to get back to you on that.

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: That's okay. I
5 actually just wanted to congratulate you on your diversion
6 efforts and just cheer you on. And that should be no
7 problem. Okay. Thank you.

8 Pat.

9 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item K is going to be
10 presented by Keir Furey. This is Consideration of a
11 Request to Change the Base Year to 2000 for the City of
12 Half Moon Bay. And it's in San Mateo County.

13 MR. FUREY: Good morning, Committee members.

14 The City of Half Moon Bay has requested a change
15 in base year to the year 2000 using the data from its
16 previously-approved 2000 generation base study. The City
17 has requested a 45 percent diversion rate for the 2000 new
18 base year.

19 As a result of Board staff's verification of the
20 City's new base year study data, staff is recommending a
21 number of changes. These changes can be seen in their
22 entirety in Attachment 3 of the agenda item. With these
23 changes, the City of Half Moon Bay's diversion rate for
24 the 2000 new base year could be 43 percent.

25 Staff has determined that the information for the

1 new base year is adequately documented. Therefore, the
2 staff is recommending Option 2 of the agenda item. A
3 representative for the City is present to assist in
4 answering any questions.

5 This concludes my presentation. Thank you.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Okay. And who's the
7 representative from the City?

8 MS. LEWANDOWSKI: Teresa Lewandowski from Pacific
9 Waste Consulting Group.

10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you for coming.
11 I really appreciate that.

12 I just have a question, and maybe actually the
13 question should be to you. The 43 percent diversion rate,
14 is that what we're establishing now and will it get them
15 to 50 percent? But that's what it's been for a while,
16 right, 42, 43 percent?

17 MR. FUREY: That's correct. In that range.
18 They've been doing a generation study every year for the
19 last four or five years and just decided to use what they
20 consider the representative year to establish a new base
21 year for simplicity reasons.

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Well, thank you. I
23 want you to come forward, and at least you can say that
24 you came to do something here. So you want to share
25 something with us, tell us some great program that the

1 City is doing?

2 MS. LEWANDOWSKI: I think you covered it.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: You're just very proud
4 of the entire program?

5 MS. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Okay. Great. Thank
7 you very much for coming.

8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Keir Furey is
9 going to present Item L. That's Consideration of Amended
10 Nondisposal Facility Element for the Portola Valley in San
11 Mateo County.

12 MR. FUREY: The town of Portola Valley has
13 amended its Nondisposal Facility Element, or NDFE, by
14 identifying and describing three additional nondisposal
15 facilities all located in other jurisdictions. This is to
16 reflect a recent change in the town's diversion activities
17 and the nondisposal facilities being utilized. These
18 facilities are already permitted. There are no pending
19 items for any of these facilities. The Board staff is
20 recommending Option 1 of the agenda item.

21 That concludes my presentation. Thank you.

22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Okay. So let me
23 understand this. The facilities are already existing.
24 But they were not counting what was coming from this
25 particular city?

1 MR. FUREY: In years past, the City was not using
2 these facilities. They were using other facilities. So
3 now that they're using them, they want to include them in
4 their planning documents.

5 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Okay. Anybody from
6 Portola?

7 MR. FUREY: No. No one is here.

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: So then we're going to
9 hold it. Okay. Thank you very much.

10 Okay, Pat. We're past approaching the end here.

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Eric Bissinger will be
12 presenting Item M. This is Consideration of the Amended
13 Nondisposal Facility Element for the City of Fremont,
14 Alameda County.

15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Okay.

16 MR. BISSINGER: Hi. Good morning. I'm Eric
17 Bissinger from the Office of Local Assistance.

18 The City of Fremont is amending the Nondisposal
19 Facility Element by identifying and describing a newly
20 established facility called the Fremont Transfer Station
21 and Materials Recovery Facility.

22 The Permit and Enforcement Division will be
23 presenting an agenda item for the proposed permit for the
24 new facility sometime in the near future. The City has
25 submitted all required documents for this facility. And,

1 therefore, staff recommends approval of this amendment to
2 the City of Fremont's NDFE.

3 This concludes my presentation.

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Okay. Is there
5 anybody from the City here?

6 MR. BISSINGER: Yes. Yeah. We have Ken Pianin.

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Ken, please come and
8 tell us.

9 MR. PIANIN: Good morning. My name is Ken Pianin
10 with the City of Fremont.

11 Fremont certainly is a great place to live and an
12 aggressive community as far as our waste management and
13 diversion programs. The new transfer station that is
14 being developed is in response to the needs from our
15 landfill which is closing. We're excited to have such a
16 state-of-the-art facility being developed to handle the
17 waste reduction needs and transfer the waste. An
18 environmental learning center will be part of that. It
19 should be an important part of Alameda County's
20 infrastructure.

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Great. When it opens,
22 let me know. Ms. Mulé and myself will go out. Thank you
23 very much for coming. Really appreciate that. Okay.

24 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Eric is also going to
25 present Item N. That's Consideration of the Five-Year

1 Review Report for the Countywide Integrated Waste
2 Management Plan for the County of Alameda.

3 MR. BISSINGER: Hello, again.

4 The Alameda County Local Task Force completed its
5 five-year review of the Countywide Integrated Waste
6 Management Plan. And in concurrence with the County, the
7 determination was made that the revision of the County's
8 plan was not necessary at this time.

9 Board staff has evaluated the County's review
10 report and determined that the required elements have been
11 addressed. Therefore, it is staff's recommendation that
12 the Board approve the County's assessment that no revision
13 is necessary. This concludes my presentation.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Okay. Is anybody here
15 from the County of Alameda?

16 MR. BISSINGER: No. They could not attend.

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: That's fine. I do
18 appreciate the fact their rate is 75 percent. I hope
19 somebody from the county of Alameda is listening. They
20 would get kudos if they were here.

21 Thank you very much. Thank you, Eric. Okay.

22 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: The final DPLA item is
23 Consideration of Request to Change the Base Year to 2000
24 for the City of Orange in Orange County. And Maria
25 Kakutani will present this item.

1 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Hi, Maria.

2 MS. KAKUTANI: Hello. Good morning, Committee
3 members.

4 The City of Orange has requested to change its
5 base year from 1990 to 2000 using the data from its
6 previously approved 2000 generation base study. The City
7 originally submitted a 2000 -- a base year change request
8 with a diversion rate of 54 percent for 2000. As part of
9 the base year study review, Board staff conducted numerous
10 site visits to verify diversion tonnage claimed.

11 As a result, staff is recommending some changes.
12 These changes can be seen in its entirety on Attachment 4
13 of this agenda item. With these changes, the City's
14 diversion rate for the 2000 new base year would be 53
15 percent for 2000; 54 percent for 2001; and 52 percent for
16 2002.

17 Board staff has determined that the base year
18 change request is adequately documented. Staff,
19 therefore, recommends the Board adopt Option 2. And
20 representatives from the City are present to answer any
21 questions.

22 This concludes my presentation.

23 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you, Maria.

24 Is there anybody here from --

25 MS. KAKUTANI: Lisa Matterd from the City of

1 Orange is here.

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Great. How are you?

3 Thank you for coming.

4 MS. MATTERD: Lisa Matterd with the City of
5 Orange.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Excellent. Tell us
7 what great programs you're going to have. I know I'm
8 reading them. There's quite a few, but one that is really
9 exciting for you.

10 MS. MATTERD: Unlike some of the other cities
11 you've heard from this morning, Orange is nearly built
12 out. We have a lot of redevelopment going on and some new
13 residential construction going on on our east end.

14 However, we have some large institutional and
15 commercial projects going on. We have a couple of
16 hospitals who are having to do some seismic retrofitting
17 and expanding. We have Chapman University, which
18 continues to expand. It's doubled in size, student body
19 wise, in probably the last ten or twelve years. And they
20 have a master plan that calls for much continued
21 expansion.

22 As well as, we have our commercial -- or
23 residential versus non-residential is quite high.
24 Non-residential is about 85 percent, and so that,
25 obviously, the C&D, the construction and the commercial

1 sector, are the areas that we're going to continue to
2 target for diversion.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Well, we certainly
4 commend the fact that you are reaching 53 percent
5 recycling. What I want to do is ask you, please ask you
6 increase that even more so.

7 MS. MATTERD: Continue to raise it. We intend
8 to. We're certainly going to try.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: I mean, you're doing a
10 little bit better than the overall statewide by five
11 percentage points. But I think because your city is
12 newer, in a sense, you know, when you compare it to other
13 cities, you have the ability to really impact new people
14 coming in and implement programs. It's a lot easier. You
15 have a great record. So I'm just going to ask you to
16 continue that and do a better job so you increase that
17 even more.

18 MS. MATTERD: Thank you. And I would just like
19 to thank the Office of Local Assistance staff. We've been
20 working with Maria and Cara. And more recently Terri
21 Edwards is helping us with our C&D ordinance -- our future
22 C&D ordinance. I'd like to thank them for all of their
23 help.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you.

25 Okay. Thank you, Pat. I really appreciate it.

1 Thank you to all of your staff. Okay. Patty.

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Patty Wohl, Waste
3 Prevention and Market Development Division. Good morning,
4 Madam Chair and Board Member Mulé. In the interest of
5 time, I'll make my Director's Report pretty brief.

6 I did want to mention that in regards to the
7 Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program, we do
8 have 28 businesses that we're currently working with. So
9 we're optimistic about that. We're bringing one loan
10 forward this month, and we plan to bring another one
11 forward next month. But we're hoping that that 28 starts
12 to gel, and we can bring you several.

13 Also, I wanted to announce the Trade Show April
14 6th and 7th in Ontario. Staff is busily working on all
15 the last-minute activities related to that. We have over
16 80 exhibitors signed on already. So we're really
17 encouraged by that.

18 And then just last I want to encourage anyone to
19 come to the workshop that's this afternoon at 1:30. It's
20 an opportunity to kind of highlight some of our businesses
21 and have staff interact with the businesses and the zone
22 administrators. So that should be a fun little event.

23 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Well, if we finish
24 this in due time, we will be there.

25 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: I'm committed to it.

1 So with that, I'll start Agenda Item Q, which is
2 your Board Item 19, Consideration of the Recycling Market
3 Development Revolving Loan Program Application for
4 Arboricultural Specialities, Inc. And Jim La Tanner will
5 present.

6 SUPERVISOR LA TANNER: Good morning.

7 This agenda item presents for consideration the
8 Arboricultural Specialties, Inc., application to the RMDZ
9 Loan Program in the amount of \$780,000. The loan is for
10 their new green waste recycling yard project. Proceeds
11 will be used to finance the purchase of real estate, up to
12 500,000 cap, consisting of a seven-acre parcel and
13 machinery and equipment in Richmond within the Contra
14 Costa County RMDZ, recycling market development zone.

15 The company will recover urban tree logs from the
16 greater San Francisco Bay Area and recycle urban logs that
17 are sent to the West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill and
18 other nearby landfills. Storm damaged trees are a natural
19 source of material. What they'll do with these is the
20 company will prepare the logs as feedstock for mill
21 operators in making dimensional lumber products to create
22 usable wood chip and mulch products.

23 Permitting and Enforcement have reviewed the
24 applicant's permit requirements. The local LEA has been
25 notified of this. And at this time, no permits are needed

1 until they move on site. Part of the site is in the city
2 of Richmond. Part of it's in the county. Depends where
3 the machinery actually is. But the site is zoned P-1,
4 light industrial. The Loan Committee did meet on
5 March 3rd and approved the loan as presented.

6 The project will divert an additional 3,000 tons
7 per year of green waste from California landfills. It is
8 projected that three new jobs will be created.

9 Staff recommends that the Committee approve this,
10 but that will be deferred to the Board.

11 I would also like to introduce the applicant.
12 Brian Pinske is here in the audience, should you have any
13 questions. He's president of the company. He's a
14 certified arborist and has been in the tree care business
15 for over 25 years.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Great. Who's the
17 person here?

18 SUPERVISOR LA TANNER: Brian.

19 MR. PINSKE: My name is Brian Pinske. And I'm
20 the owner, the President of the Arboricultural
21 Specialities.

22 This green waste recycle yard is something we've
23 been thinking about for quite a few years. And, actually,
24 we already conduct components of this yard in different
25 areas around Contra Costa and Alameda Counties. This

1 particular green waste recycling yard is kind of a
2 consolidation of a number of different activities that
3 we're already doing.

4 And it's also part of an -- I'd say an exit
5 strategy for some other recycled and diversion operators
6 that have found they could do the business because they
7 were doing it through a nonprofit status and doing it for
8 free of charge to the community, which was a good thing,
9 but it just never worked out. So now we're in -- right
10 now, we're cleaning up some of their messes. And we're
11 very confident that this new project will work.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: So you have been in
13 the business -- in other words, similar business --

14 MR. PINSKE: I've been diverting logs in this
15 manner for about 23 years. So our business currently
16 ranges from talking about trees to removing trees. We do
17 a lot of consultation services, and we do a lot of -- on
18 this side and a lot of urban logging, as you will, on the
19 far side, and a lot of tree trimming and tree removal in
20 between. So we're always in contact with log material.

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: So you have contracts
22 with the cities? You're the landscaping --

23 MR. PINSKE: Yeah. We have --

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: -- contractor?

25 MR. PINSKE: In the DBA, the Professional Tree

1 Care Company, we have 43 employees. And we do work from
2 Sacramento to Santa Rosa to Monterey. So we have
3 contracts with the state, with many cities, with many
4 developers, and you know, just many different people.
5 Over 6,000 clients.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: And the reason why I
7 ask the question, you already have a feedstock that will
8 be coming into this facility then. And you have contracts
9 with Caltrans already or --

10 MR. PINSKE: Yes.

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: What do you call it, a
12 pre- -- there's a word.

13 SUPERVISOR LA TANNER: Master service agreement?

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: When this happens,
15 when this begins operation, then the feedstock will
16 already come?

17 MR. PINSKE: Yes.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: So you have a
19 secure --

20 MR. PINSKE: The feedstock is there now. And,
21 actually, you know, in my vision of this, this is kind of
22 a clearinghouse, kind of a way for all the material to get
23 to one spot.

24 One of the biggest problems with diverting this
25 material successfully is that when the material is being

1 brought to a mill, for instance, to be made into
2 dimensional lumber, if we were to bring one pine log, the
3 mill would say, "We don't want this pine log." But if we
4 bring them a log truck full of pine logs, they can do
5 something with it. They can set up their mill in a way to
6 make dimensional lumber.

7 So the problem is you have -- not just us, but
8 many, many tree companies and many, many different
9 entities that have this material, but not situated in a
10 way that could be presented to the commercial mills for
11 them to be successful. So it's a matter of really kind of
12 getting them all in one place, sorting them by species,
13 and then getting them to the right place for the right
14 people to do the right thing with.

15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: And you have already a
16 marketing plan?

17 MR. PINSKE: Yes.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: We saw it; right?

19 SUPERVISOR LA TANNER: Yes, staff has reviewed
20 the business plan. Yes.

21 MR. PINSKE: We actually do this map. This is an
22 operation for us. We found in our business practices that
23 by doing it this way in our business, it's just more
24 profitable to us. We don't take anything to the landfill
25 from any of our services ever. So it's been -- you know,

1 it's been something that we've kind of molded in a smaller
2 model, and now we're feeling that it would be easy to turn
3 this into a bigger thing.

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you, Brian.

5 Good luck. Let us know when you are operational. Open
6 for business.

7 Okay. Just so that Brian knows, this will go to
8 the Board. I don't know if anybody else will have
9 questions, but we'll be voting on this --

10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Do an abbreviated
11 presentation at the Board.

12 And then Agenda Item R, which is your Board Item
13 20, Consideration of Application to Review the Chico
14 Recycling Market Development Zone Designation. And Steve
15 Boyd will present.

16 MR. BOYD: Good morning, Committee members. I'm
17 Steve Boyd with the Recycling Business Assistance Section.

18 And Item R asks for consideration of the
19 application to renew the Chico Recycling Market
20 Development Zone. As outlined in Public Resource Code
21 Section 42011, a recycling market development zone is
22 approved for a period of ten years. At the end of this
23 term, the zone administrator or another delegated
24 authority may ask the Board to renew the zone designation
25 for another ten-year term.

1 And just a little background here. The Chico
2 RMDZ is administered by the Environmental Services
3 Management Division located within the city of Chico's
4 manager's office. The zone encompasses approximately 130
5 square miles in the northern portion of Butte County and
6 includes the city of Chico along with unincorporated
7 industrial property that's located due west and south of
8 the Chico urban area.

9 Since 1994, four RMDZ loans totaling 1,167,000
10 have been made to this zone and its businesses. And in
11 compliance with established regulations, the Chico Zone
12 Administrator has submitted a formal request and
13 application to the Board for consideration. Resolutions
14 from the Butte County Board of Supervisors and the City
15 Council approving the renewal application of the Chico
16 RMDZ was also submitted to us.

17 Every zone has a story, and the Chico RMDZ story
18 will be presented this afternoon in our workshop.

19 A decision to renew the Chico RMDZ for another
20 ten-year term will allow recycled content product
21 manufacturers and other qualified businesses to continue
22 receiving our technical support and financial services
23 provided by the Board's RMDZ program.

24 Staff recommends that the Board approve Option 1
25 and adopt Resolution Number 2005-77. And if you have any

1 questions, our Chico Recycling Zone Administrator, Linda
2 Herman, is in the audience.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Good.

4 Where's Linda? Hi, Linda. How's Chico?

5 MS. HERMAN: Great.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Good. Not chico, not
7 small.

8 MS. HERMAN: No.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Good. You're doing a
10 very good job.

11 MS. HERMAN: Thank you.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: And everybody in your
13 area gets along and pushing for businesses and getting
14 together and holding hands and singing Kumbaya.

15 MS. HERMAN: Right. We have a very unique
16 community. And we all work together. Not that we don't
17 have contentious times. But we do try to work very hard.
18 And I'm very proud of what Chico has done as far as
19 diversion.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: I don't see any reason
21 why we should deny this.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: I just look forward to
23 hearing the presentation this afternoon. Thank you.

24 MS. HERMAN: That's definitely one of our success
25 stories.

1 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: Thank you very much.

2 Thank you.

3 Patty.

4 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: That's it for me.

5 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MARIN: That's it. No more.

6 Does anybody wish to address the Committee for
7 any reason? Any at all?

8 Hearing none, this meeting is closed. Thank you

9 (Thereupon the California Integrated Waste
10 Management Board, Sustainability and Market
11 Development Committee adjourned at 11:36 a.m.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 I, TIFFANY C. KRAFT, a Certified Shorthand
3 Reporter of the State of California, and Registered
4 Professional Reporter, do hereby certify:

5 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the
6 foregoing hearing was reported in shorthand by me,
7 Tiffany C. Kraft, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the
8 State of California, and thereafter transcribed into
9 typewriting.

10 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
11 attorney for any of the parties to said hearing nor in any
12 way interested in the outcome of said hearing.

13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
14 this 17th day March, 2005.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 TIFFANY C. KRAFT, CSR, RPR
24 Certified Shorthand Reporter
25 License No. 12277

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

□